

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiffs,

CRIM. CASE NO. 10-20202

v.

PAUL D. BORMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

SHERRY WASHINGTON,

Defendant.

_____ /

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL

BACKGROUND

On June 29, 2011, Defendant Sherry Washington was convicted of Conspiracy to Commit Program Fraud, 18 U.S.C. §§ 371 and 666, and Conspiracy to Launder Money, 18 U.S.C. § 1956(h).

On July 5, 2011, Defendant Washington filed a motion for an extension of time (30 days) for filing a motion for new trial. Over Government objection the Court granted an extension until August 12, 2011.

On August 12, Defendant Washington filed the instant Motion for New Trial, alleging as the sole ground, ineffective assistance of trial counsel.

The Court, having had the benefit of presiding at the trial, concludes that Defendant's counsel Deday LaRene, Esq., did a highly effective job at the trial.

There was overwhelming evidence of Defendant Washington's guilt on both Counts. At

the same time, Mr. LaRene performed thorough and inciteful cross-examination of all witnesses, in particular the three co-Defendants who testified against Defendant Washington. Whether or not there was a contract policy at Detroit Public Schools' risk management program was not a critical issue; the testimony about Defendant's kickbacks, supported by admitted bank records and the uncontested testimony of cash drops in surreptitious ways, and the plan to cover up and deny guilt were the critical issues. Mr. LaRene did the best job any excellent lawyer could with the cards he was dealt by Defendant's conduct.

In conclusion, there is no factual or legal basis in support of Defendant Washington's Motion for New Trial. Defense counsel's performance was not deficient under *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668 (1984).

Accordingly, Defendant's Motion for a New Trial is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

DATED:

9-15-11



PAUL D. BORMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE